

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

YPL0080US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Typed or printed name \_\_\_\_\_

Application Number

10/773,507

Filed

2/5/2004

First Named Inventor

KWON, Taejon

Art Unit

1631

Examiner

ZHOU, Shubo

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

/Sandra L. Shaner/

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

Signature

Sandra L. Shaner

Typed or printed name

☒ attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number 47934

860-286-2929

Telephone number

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 \_\_\_\_\_

May 12, 2009

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.  
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☒ \*Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: KWON, Taejon  
Serial No.: 10/773,507  
Conf. No.: 6812  
Filed: February 5, 2004  
Title: **SYSTEM, METHOD, AND COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR  
DETERMINING A LOCATION OF A TARGET SEQUENCE IN A  
GENOME SEQUENCE**  
Examiner: ZHOU, Shubo  
Art Unit: 1631  
Docket No: YPL-0080

**VIA EFS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

In response to the Final Office Action dated December 12, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated March 4, 2009, and in conjunction with the Notice of Appeal filed concurrently herewith, the Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review:

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 and 15 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Claims 1-12 and 15 are not obvious over Benson et al.**

Claims 1-12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Benson et al. (Nucleic Acids Research, 1999, Vol. 27, pages 38-43) (previously cited; hereinafter "Benson").

The claimed invention is drawn to a system and method for determining a location of a target sequence in a genome sequence, and to a computer readable medium having embodied thereon a computer program comprising computer readable code for executing the method.

Claim 1 is drawn to a system for determining a location of a target sequence in a genome sequence, comprising: a storage unit for storing a crosslink map, wherein the crosslink map comprises records of sequence information for a plurality of versions of a genome sequence; an information search unit, for searching for identifier information and sequence information corresponding to a target sequence among the records in the crosslink map; and a location estimation unit, for determining a reference group comprising a reference sequence information for an organism, wherein the reference sequence information is represented in the crosslink map by more than a predetermined number of records; calculating a difference value of a start position and an end position of the reference sequence information obtained from the crosslink map; and determining a location of the target sequence in the genome sequence by a location shift corresponding to the difference value, wherein a record for a sequence information in the crosslink map comprises a name of a genome sequence, a version of the genome sequence, an identifier of a sequence information in the genome sequence, a start position and an end position of the sequence information in the genome sequence, and a length of the sequence information in the genome sequence.

Claim 7 is drawn to a method of determining a location of a target sequence in a genome sequence, the method comprising: inputting a target sequence; searching for identifier information and sequence information corresponding to the target sequence in a crosslink map, wherein the crosslink map comprises records of sequence information for a plurality of versions of a genome sequence; determining a reference group comprising a reference sequence information for an organism, wherein the reference sequence information is represented in the crosslink map by more than a predetermined number of records; calculating a difference value of a start position and an end position of the reference sequence information obtained from the crosslink map; determining a location of the target sequence in the genome sequence by a location shift corresponding to the difference value; and outputting the location of the target sequence in the genome sequence to a user, wherein a record for a sequence information recorded in the crosslink map comprises a name of a genome sequence, a version of the genome sequence, an identifier for a sequence information in the genome sequence, a start position and an end position of the sequence information in the genome sequence, and a length of the sequence information in the genome sequence.

Claim 12 is drawn to a computer readable medium having embodied thereon a computer program comprising computer readable code for executing the method of claim 7.

Benson et al. provide a general description of certain aspects of the GenBank® public database of nucleotide and protein sequences. (p. 12, 1st col., Introduction) Benson et al. describe the organization of GenBank (pp. 38-40); how the database is built by input of new sequences via one of two programs, Bankit or Sequin (pp. 40-41); and retrieving GenBank data using Entrez (pp. 41-42), performing sequence similarity searching with the BLAST family of search programs (p. 42), or accessing GenBank via other means, such as anonymous FTP (p. 42). Benson discloses general facts about the function of some members of the BLAST family of search programs. For example, Benson discloses that a BLAST 2.0 search accepts a query sequence and the similarity search is performed using a PAM or BLOSUM scoring matrix, resulting in a set of gapped alignments. (p. 42, 2<sup>nd</sup> full para.)

However, Benson et al. are silent with respect to at least a location estimation unit for determining a reference group comprising a reference sequence information for an organism, having the limitations recited in claim 1, and also with respect to the elements determining a reference group comprising a reference sequence information for an organism, wherein the reference sequence information is represented in the crosslink map by more than a predetermined number of records; calculating a difference value of a start position and an end position of the reference sequence information obtained from the crosslink map; and determining a location of the target sequence in the genome sequence by a location shift corresponding to the difference value recited in claims 7 and 12.

The Office Action states on p. 4, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph that Benson et al. do not explicitly disclose a location estimation unit as recited in claim 1 and then alleges that “given that all the functions performed by these units in the claims are also performed in Benson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the system of BLAST + GENBANK” includes such a unit. However, the Office Action fails to provide any evidence documenting that Benson does in fact disclose a unit performing the functions of the location estimation unit as recited in claim 1 or that Benson discloses the following elements of claims 7 and 12: determining a reference group comprising a reference sequence information for an organism, wherein the reference sequence information is represented in the crosslink map by more than a predetermined

number of records; calculating a difference value of a start position and an end position of the reference sequence information obtained from the crosslink map; and determining a location of the target sequence in the genome sequence by a location shift corresponding to the difference value.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has used an improper standard in arriving at the rejection of the above claims under section 103, based on improper hindsight given the guidance of the instant specification and claims, which fails to consider the totality of applicant's invention and the totality of the cited reference. Section 103 sets out the test for obviousness determinations. It states, in pertinent part, that such determinations are to be made by consideration of

. . . the differences between subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the [pertinent] art.

In making a Section 103 rejection, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The Examiner “. . . can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references”. Id Applicants assert that the Examiner has failed to provide the required showing that Benson teaches these elements or that the knowledge was generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Further, while the Office Action states that BLAST uses a query sequence to search the entire database to find homologous sequences and locations of the query sequence in the sequences in the database, it does not cite anywhere in Benson et al. that the following limitations of claim 7 are taught: determining a reference group comprising a reference sequence information for an organism, wherein the reference sequence information is represented in the crosslink map by more than a predetermined number of records; calculating a difference value of a start position and an end position of the reference sequence information obtained from the crosslink map; or determining a location of the target sequence in the genome sequence by a location shift corresponding to the difference value. Neither does the Office Action explain what general knowledge of one of skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made supplements the teachings of Benson et al. that would render the method of claims 7 and 9-11 obvious. Thus,

Applicants assert that the Office Action has failed to establish that claims 7 and 9-11 are obvious over Benson et al.

Furthermore, as Benson et al. fails to teach all limitations of the method of claim 7 and 10-11 as noted above, Benson et al. cannot teach all elements of the computer readable medium of claim 12 having embodied thereon a computer program comprising computer readable code for executing the method of claim 7, nor can Benson et al. teach all the functional limitations for components of the system of claims 1-2, 4-6 and 15 for performing the method for determining a location of a target sequence in a genome sequence. Therefore Applicants assert that the Office Action fails to establish that claims 1-2, 4-6, 12, and 15 are obvious over Benson et al.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Benson et al.

The fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) is enclosed herewith. However, if any fees are due with respect to this submission, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

/Sandra L. Shaner/

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra L. Shaner, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 47,934

Date: May 12, 2009  
**CANTOR COLBURN LLP**  
20 Church Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06130-3207  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No.: 23413